STATE OF MONTANA 2 REFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS 3 IN THE MATTER OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE NO. 22-81: 4 TOWNSEND EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 5 Complainant. 6 - va -FINAL ORDER 7 BROADWATER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 7, 8 Defendant: 9 10 No exceptions having been filed, pursuant to ARM 24.26.215, 11 to the Pindings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Recommended 12 Order issued on March 18, 1982, by Hearing Examiner Jack H. 13 Calhoun: 14 THEREPORE, this Board adopts that Recommended Order in this 15 matter as Its FINAL ORDER. 16 day of April, 1982. 17 BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS 18 39. 20 24 22 CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 23 The undersigned does certify that a true and correct copy 24 of this document was mailed to the following on the 22 day of April, 1982; 25 Emilie Loring 26 HILLEY & LORING, P.C. 121 4th Street North 27 Great Palls, Mr. 59401 28 Chadwick H. Smith Smith Law Firm, P.C. 29 P.O. Box 604 Belena, MT 59624 30.

31

feli

STATE OF MONTANA BEFORE THE BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

IN THE MATTER OF UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICE NO. 22-81:

TOWNSEND EDUCATION ASSOCIATION)

Complainant.

V8.

т

2

3

4

Б.

6

 $\mathbf{7}$

8

Ø.

10

-11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

10

20.

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

20

30

31

BROADWATER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 7.

Defendant.

FINDINGS OF PACE CONCLUSION OF LAW RECOMMENDED ORDER

INTRODUCTION 1.

On May 20, 1981, Complainant filed an unfair labor practice charge alleging Defendant had violated section 39-31-401(5) HCA by refusing to arbitrate a contract grievance. Defendant denied that it had committed any violation. At a pre-hearing conference held on October 19, 1981 the parties agreed to attempt to stipulate to the relevant facts involved. A stipulation and briefing schedule were filed on December 17, 1981. The last brief was filed on February 4, 1982. Complainant is represented by Ma. Emilie Loring, Defendant by Mr. Chadwick Smith.

11. ISSUES

The issues listed below are those stipulated to by the parties:

- 1. Whether the Board of Personnel Appeals has jurisdiction of the subject matter stated in the charge or complaint filed herein and whether the charge and the preceding stipulation of facts state an unfair labor practice charge under section 39-31-401(5) MCA.
- 2. Whether the non-renewal of a non-tenure teacher's teaching contract is a grievance as defined in the collective bargaining agreement.
 - Whather the collective bargaining agreement provides

...... 4500

9

7

12 13

14 15

16 17

19

18

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

28

29

30

32

for the binding arbitration of grievances.

- 4. Whether the defendant school board may submit to binding arbitration the matter of possible violation of the due process clause of the collective bargaining agreement in the non-renewal of non-tenure teacher Donna Downs' teaching contract.
- Whether submission to such arbitration is an unlawful delegation of the school board's lawful power, duty and obligation.

III. FACTS

The following facts were stipulated to by the parties:

- 1. The Townsend Education Association, affiliated with the Montana Education Association is the duly recognized exclusive representative for collective bargaining of the faculty employed by defendant in the Townsend schools.
- Defendant, Broadwater County School District #7, m
 body corporate of the State of Montana, operates the elementary school in Townsend, Montana.
- The parties have a collective bargaining agreement,
 Exhibit A.
- 4. On March 10, 1981, the Board of Trustees of the defendant voted unanimously not to renew the teaching contract of Donna Downs for the 1961-1982 school year because "a better teacher can be obtained." Donna Downs was present at the meeting, having been notified by letter that the matter of ber re-election for the 1981-82 school year would be determined at that time, Exhibit B.
- Donna Downs, a non-tenure teacher in the elementary school, was notified on March 11, 1981, that her teaching contract would not be renewed for 1981-82, Exhibit C.
- 6. Downs requested the reasons for the non-renewal on March 19, 1981, Exhibit D.

19 20

21

22

23: 24

25 26

27 2.8

20 30

31 32

STREET, STREET, ST.

- Superintendent Knodel, on behalf of defendant, 7. supplied the reason on March 20, 1981, Exhibit E.
- 8... An alleged grievance was filed on March 20, 1981 by the Townsend Education Association on behalf of Donna Downs, Exhibit F. The matter was handled by Scan Mathews, an MEA staff representative.
- Both the Principal and the Superintendent said the relief requested, issuance of a contract for 1981-1982, was not a decision they could make.
- 10. On April 7, 1981, the Board reaffirmed its decision of March 10, 1981, Exhibit G.
- 11. On April 15, 1981, the MEA requested a list of arbitrators from the Board of Personnel Appeals, Exhibit H.
- 12. On April 21, 1981 BPA Administrator Jensen supplied a list of arbitrators, Exhibit I.
- 13. On April 22, 1981, Superintendent Knodel, on defendant's behalf, requested the BPA to ignore the request for arbitrators, Exhibit J.
- 14. The defendant refused and refuses to submit the alleged grievance to arbitration.
- 15. On May 20, 1981, the Townsend Education Association filed unfair labor practice charges with the Board of Personnel Appeals, alleging the refusal of the defendant to strike names from the list of arbitrators submitted by the Board of Personnel Appeals or to submit the matter to arbitration was a refusal to bargain in good faith.
- 16. On June 2, 1981, Robert R. Jensen, Administrator of the Personnel Appeals Division of the Department of Labor and Industry of the State of Montna notified the Superintendent of Schools at Townsend by letter as follows:

Although there is no specific statutory authority for our involvement in this kind of activity, we offer the services in an effort to help parties resolve their

differences. We have no authority to enforce the utilization of the lists nor do we take a position on the appropriateness of the lists when requested by only one party. We assume the parties jointly decide whether to use lists or not.

See Exhibit K.

1

2

ġ.

ö,

ø

7

8

49

10

11

12

13

14

15

161

17

18.

19.

20

21.

22

28

24

25

26

27

2H

29

30

31

13121

17. On June 29, 1981, the defendant filed an Answer denying the unfair labor practice charges and raising the issues listed above.

IV. OPINION

The stipulated facts acknowledged the existence of a collective bargaining agreement between the parties and referred to exhibit "A." For the convenience of the reader the two provisions of the contract relevant here are quoted below:

ARTICLE IV, TEACHER RIGHTS. . . 4.2 No teacher shall be disciplined, reprimanded, reduced in rank or compensation, discharged, or deprived of any professional advantage without due process. Any such assertion by the Board, or any agent or representative thereof shall be subject to the grievance procedure herein set forth.

ARTICLE VI, GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE . . . 6.4 Procedure . . . F. Level Four. If the grievance has not been satisfactorily resolved at the Third Level, the grievance may be filed with the Board of Personnel Appeals.

A number of issues were raised by the parties in their stipulation; however, whether most of them should be addressed depends on whether the parties' collective bargaining agreement provides for final and binding grievance arbitration.

If the contract compels the parties to settle their differences by submitting to arbitration, then a refusal to do so is tantamount to a refusal to bargin in good faith and is an unfair labor practice under 39-31-401(5) MCA. City of Livingston v. Montana Council No. 9, AFSCME, 174, Mont. 421, 571 P. 2d 374 (1977). Therefore, it is necessary to examine the contract to determine whether it provides for final and binding grievance arbitration.

The collective bargaining agreement in the present case

does not contain a "standard" arbitration provision. listing in Article IV certain actions by the employer which may not be taken without due process, the contract goes on to provide that assertions to the contrary by the school hoard will be subject to the orievance procedure. The grievance procedure is comprised of four levels. Level one requires that the teacher with the grievance discuss it with the principal. Level two provides that it may be referred to the Superintendent who will arrange for a hearing with the teacher and/or the association. At level two the parties have the right to be represented and to call witnesses, after which the Superintendent must provide his written decision and the reasons therefore to the association. At level three the grievance is to be filed with the school board where the parties, their representatives and the Superintendent neet with the board or its designated committee to resolve the matter. Level four provides that the grievance may be filed with the Board of Personnel Appeals if it is not resolved at level three.

Complainant argues that the final step in the contract grievance procedure reflects the parties intent to obtain a list of arbitrators from this Board because, it is urged, that is the only interpretation of the clause that makes any sense. In effect this Board is asked to read into the language of the contract a final and binding arbitration requirement. However, there are other conclusions which one could legically draw from reading the agreement.

The parties may well have thought that the Board of Personnel Appeals had jurisdiction, that when the grievance was filed a mediator or fact-finder would be sent in to assist the parties in resolving their dispute, or that they could bestow jurisdiction on the Board. The number of

24

255

260

27

28

20

30.

31

possibilities as to what they may have intended is limited only by the amount of time one spends engaging in speculation. The language used could also have been the result of a bargaining cospromise where the toachers settled for something less than arbitration as the <u>quid pro quo</u> for something else; greater wages, for example. In any case, absent a clearer provision on the subject, I cannot read arbitration into the procedure. The absence of the words "arbitrate" or "arbitration" could lead one to conclude that the omission was by design. Any other interpretation would seem to suggest that one party, or both, did not know the significance of a clearly stated arbitration clause.

Since there is nothing in the stipulated facts to indicate the parties intended to arbitrate their differences.

Since there is nothing in the stipulated facts to indicate the parties intended to arbitrate their differences during the term of the agreement. I conclude there was no obligation on the part of Defendant to participate in an arbitration process. The collective bargaining agreement does not provide for the arbitration of grievances; therefore, the refusal by Defendant to submit the matter to an arbitrator was not a failure to bargain in good faith.

Having found that the stipulated facts do not state an unfair labor practice because the contract does not provide for the arbitration of grievances, it is not necessary to address the questions raised in issues Nos. 2, 4 and 5.

V. CONCLUSION OF LAW

Defendant did not violate 39-31-401(5) MCA by refusing to submit the contract dispute to arbitration.

VI. RECOMMENDED ORDER

There being no violation found, this unfair labor practice charge is dismissed.

ï

20:

VII. NOTICE

Exceptions to these Findings of Fact, Conclusion of Law and Recommended Order may be filed within twenty days of the date of service. If no exceptions are filed within such time, this recommended order shall become the final order of the Board of Personnel Appeals. Exceptions should be addressed to the Board of Personnel Appeals, Capitol Station, Helena, Montana 59620.

Dated this 18/h day of March, 1982.

BOARD OF PERSONNEL APPEALS

ACK H. CM.HOUN Hearing Examiner

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned does certify that a true and correct copy of this document was nailed to the following on the 18th day of 17thele , 1982:

Enilie Loring Billey & Loring, F.C. Attorneys At Law 121 4th Street North Great Falls, Montana 59401

Chadwick H. Smith Smith Law Firm, P.C. P.O. Box 604 Helena, Montana 59601

PAD4:G/7

''' Jennifir Jacoticen

-

1

2

3

ä

41

7

8

9

10

3.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

10

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30